

March 13, 1975

PRESIDENT: Are you ready for the question? The question is the advancement of LB 429. Oh, Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY: (mic inactivated) . . . Chambers would yield to a question.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Sure.

SENATOR MURPHY: Senator, in a recent meeting I had occasion to attend, the statement was made, and I believe it to be true although I certainly could not substantiate it, that the State of Massachusetts, last year, their Bar Association, who apparently has that power, did lift 176 licenses from attorneys in that state. Does the Nebraska Bar Association indulge in that kind of peer review? If so, do you know how many licenses they may have lifted in the last year?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I'm . . . the Nebraska Bar Association doesn't have the power to lift any licenses. They feel complaints. They take from a year to a year and a half to complete their process of investigating, then they turn it over the Supreme Court with a recommendation. If they decide that no action should be taken, then the Supreme Court never hears the complaint. The Bar Association does not have the power to lift a license. All of the regulation, licensing, and disciplining is done by the State Supreme Court, not the Bar Association.

SENATOR MURPHY: Do you know how many such licenses they may have reviewed, or requested be lifted this year?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: They were compelled to review the license of G. Bradford Cook. Last year, or the year before, they lifted the license of an attorney. I don't remember where he was from, the State Supreme Court did because he stole some of his clients money and that's why they took his license, the Supreme Court did.

SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Senator Syas.

SENATOR SYAS: I'll be very brief. If you notice the committee report, of course, some members voted this out, in all fairness, with the idea that it was a very important issue and it should be debated on this floor. I was not one of them that voted it out just for debate, I'm for it. A few years ago I introduced a bill similar to this, but not the same. I simply said that no person should be required to belong to any professional group against his will, something like that. To the amazement of myself I got the bill over clear on Select File before the attorneys moved in on it. They killed it, of course, which I expected on General File. This Legislature, I might say, has been always one that says, like on labor, that you shouldn't have a closed shop. The fact is that we have a constitutional provision against the closed shop, yet when they're faced with another closed shop they've always seen fit to allow this closed shop. I don't think that this Legislature can continue forever go ride two horses going in two different directions. I think it's about time that we be consistent. Either someone introduce an amendment to the constitution to allow labor not to have